



Office of the Secretary of Defense
Reserve Forces Policy Board
Annual Meeting Minutes



Thursday, 5 September, 2013

Location of Meeting: Army Navy Country Club, Arlington, Virginia

Members Present

1. MajGen Arnold Punaro, USMCR (Retired) - Chairman
2. MG Marcia Anderson, USAR - Deputy Chief Army Reserve (IMA)
3. SGM Michael Biere, USAR - Enlisted Military Advisor to the Reserve Forces Policy Board (Non-voting)
4. VADM John Cotton, USN (Retired)
5. Maj Gen Michael Edwards, ANG - The Adjutant General of Colorado
6. The Honorable Grier Martin, Member North Carolina House of Representatives
7. General John W. Handy, USAF (Retired)
8. Ms. Paulette Mason – Former Delaware Chair, Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve
9. MajGen Darrell L. Moore, USMCR
10. Dr. John Nagl – Headmaster, Haverford School and Non-Resident Senior Fellow at CNAS
11. Mr. Sergio Pecori - President & Chief Executive Officer of Hanson Professional Services Inc.
12. Lt Gen James E. Sherrard III, USAFR (Retired)
13. Maj Gen James Stewart, USAFR - Military Executive of the Board (Non-voting)
14. The Honorable Gary (Gene) Taylor - Former Congressman from Mississippi
15. Ms. Maria Vorel, Retired FEMA Disaster Operations Coordinator
16. MajGen Leo Williams III, USMCR (Retired)

Invited Guests

1. Ms. Janet St. Laurent, Government Accountability Office
2. Mr. Richard Wightman, Jr., Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs
3. MG Jonathan Treacy, Director, National Guard Joint Staff
4. MG Bert Mizusawa, USAR, Assistant to CJCS for Reserve Matters
5. MG Scott Gorske, ARNG, Assistant to CJCS for National Guard Matters
6. MG William Wofford, ARNG, Nominated Board Member
7. MG Kenneth Bouldin, USAR(Retired), RFPB Fellows Society
8. MG Gus Hargett, ARNG (Retired), President of the National Guard Association of the United States
9. MajGen Andrew Davis, USMCR (Retired), Executive Director of the Reserve Officers Association
10. The Honorable Dennis M. McCarthy, National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force
11. The Honorable Christine H. Fox, John Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory
12. The Honorable Robert F. Hale, Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller)

RFPB Staff

1. CAPT Steven Knight, USN (DFO)
2. Col Don Bevis, ANG
3. Col Jay Jensen, USAFR
4. Col Reidar Larsen, USMCR
5. COL Timothy Lynch, USAR
6. COL Robert Preiss, ARNG
7. Col Mary Salcido, ANG
8. SMSgt Joyce Voyles, USAFR
9. SFC Ivalisse Rivera-Moya, USAR
10. Mr. Alexander Sabol, DoD Civilian

Public Observers

1. RADM John Acton (Retired)
2. MCPO Mark Allen
3. Mr. Miller Andrews
4. MG David Baldwin
5. LTC Nicole Balliet
6. Mr. Craig Bambrough
7. Col Harvey Barnum (Retired)
8. Mr. Paul Bergson
9. Mr. Kyle Combs
10. LTC John Paul Cook
11. MG Wesley Craig
12. Lt Gen Russell Davis (Retired)
13. VADM Dirk Debbink (Retired)
14. Maj Doug Dickson
15. CAPT Matt Dubois (Retired)
16. Mr. Peter Duffy
17. Mr. Gilbert Durand
18. MG Mary Eder (Retired)
19. Mr. Bob Fielder
20. Mr. Jason Forrester
21. CDR Billy D. Franklin
22. Mr. John Grady
23. COL Leela Gray
24. Mr. Robert Green
25. Ms. Mileva Hartman
26. Mr. John Hastings
27. Mr. Dennis Hickey
28. Lt Col Kirk Hilbrecht
29. MG James Hoyer
30. Mr. Tom Jones
31. LTC Vladimir Kolchanov
32. BG Daniel Krumrei
33. Mr. Chip Long
34. SGM Gary Martz
35. Mr. Daniel McCormick
36. Mr. Jake McKinney
37. Mr. John Miller
38. The Honorable William Navas
39. Col Michelle Obata
40. Mr. Terry O'Connell
41. LTG Tom Plewes (Retired)
42. Mr. Paul Rehcamp
43. Mr. Richard Regulus
44. Ms. Katherine Rodriguez
45. CWO George Rubesha (Retired)
46. Mr. Jason Sander
47. Brig Gen Allyson Solomon
48. MG Errol Schwartz

49. Mr. Sebastian Springer
50. Lt Col Julie Small (Retired)
51. Mr. Bob Smiley
52. MG Mike Sumrall (Retired)
53. LTG Jeff Talley
54. Mr. Alan Tinder
55. Mr. Andrew Tilghman
56. Maj Gen Tonini
57. Mr. Mark Towne
58. Ms. Christine Trexler
59. CMSGT John Vallario (Retired)
60. Mr. William Valos
61. Mr. Kelly Webster
62. Mr. Jerry White
63. RDML Eric Young

0815 – Chairman Punaro administratively opened the Board to conduct required administrative business.

- The Chairman announced - As required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), the Designated Federal Officer is present and has pre-approved the opening of this meeting and its agenda
- The Chairman thanked the staff, recognized key individuals (including Barney Barnum, MOH Recipient), and commented on the RFPB Dinner and ADM Winnefeld speech.
- The Chairman welcomed members and guests.

0820 - Military Executive provided additional administrative announcements to the Board.

- Welcomed guests, members, and recently assigned Board Staff.
- Advised members that the December Board Meeting date would be flexible to accommodate the Secretary of Defense.

0825 - Chairman Punaro presided over an awards ceremony for departing Board staff member Colonel Michelle Obata.

0830 - Board commenced business in Open Session.

0830 - President, National Guard Association of the United States Remarks - Major General Gus Hargett, USA (Retired)

- Major General Hargett offered thoughts on issues of concern to the NGAUS membership.
 - Major General Hargett indicated his membership is especially concerned with protecting and maintaining the current force structure and end strength of the National Guard. He noted the dependability and reliability of the Reserve Components and stated his belief that the Guard can provide cost savings in a number of areas.
 - He expressed concern over Reserve Component representation in strategy and planning entities to help address Guard and Reserve issues. Major General Hargett noted that having the Chief of the National Guard Bureau on the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Reserve Component representation in The Joint Staff have helped, but Reserve Component capabilities and contributions still need to be fully represented and recognized throughout the Department.

- He also expressed concern over National Guard equipment readiness. While agreeing that National Guard equipment inventories are higher than ever, sustaining equipment modernization and availability are concerns. He specifically noted the aging of Air Guard aircraft compared to Active Component aircraft. He stated that the ANG aircraft average age is over 27 years while the USAF aircraft is approximately 23 years. He suggested the state of Air Force Reserve aircraft aging may be worse.
- General Hargett expressed concern over sequestration in Fiscal Year 2014 and Fiscal Year 2015. He suggested that it is important to maintain the operational reserve, adding that it is important that we not let the National Guard go back to a strategic reserve and waste a decade of investment and training.
- He suggested that existing “Boots on Ground” (BOG) Dwell policies are self-imposed limits on the availability of the force that aren’t necessarily applicable to future conflict. He noted the Reserve Components have proven that they are accessible and ready, if resourced. He added that DoD has demonstrated the flexibility of its BOG Dwell policy over the last ten years of war.
- Major General Hargett discussed the Fiscal Year 2012 Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation and the need to look at retirement and compensation. He suggested that the Active Component retirement system may start to look more like the Reserve Component retirement system in the future. He warned that changing the current Inactive Duty pay construct would undermine Reserve Component retention. Finally, he noted that the Department could save about \$2 billion by eliminating the Defense Commissary Agency and replacing it with discount cards for use at major retailers like Wal-Mart.

0845 - Executive Director, Reserve Officers Association Remarks - Major General Andrew B. Davis, USMC (Retired)

- Major General Davis opened by noting that this is a time of challenges and opportunities – opportunities to take innovative approaches to National Security.
- He suggested that it is important to maintain the effort for continued operational use of the Reserve and National Guard. He suggested it is important to follow through with developing a well-crafted definition of the phrase “operational reserve” that is consistent with the RFPB’s proposed definition.
- He emphasized the importance of developing the following concepts: the Reserve Components need “Meaningful Training for Meaningful Missions” and “The Reserves Play the Home game”.
- He expressed concern with Army Chief of Staff, Gen Odierno’s recent football analogy that suggests the Army’s Active and Reserve Components aren’t on the same team. He suggested that this sentiment might hint at the Reserve Components reverting back to the strategic reserve of the post-Vietnam days where Reserve Component units did not have equipment and ammunition to train with. He recommended that the Reserve Components should not be the bill payer for future budget cuts; should retain their high level of equipment and training readiness gained since 9/11; and that the Department should avoid allowing the Reserve Components to become a hollow force.
- He noted that it is important for the Reserve Components to have a seat at the table in senior level DoD decision-making bodies, including the Strategic Choices and Management Review, the Quadrennial Defense Review and the Quadrennial Review of Military Compensation.
- Major General Davis suggested that DoD conduct periodic, balanced reviews of the roles and missions of the Services, and consider reversibility to meet future requirements. He added that “life-cycle costs” of the Reserve Components should be considered when looking for cost effective ways to perform National Security missions.

- He also discussed Reserve Component compensation and recommended against making changes to the Inactive Duty pay system.
- Major General Davis closed by emphasizing three points: (1) The need for well-defined roles and missions in austere times with the Reserves being an affordable national defense force; (2) Reserve Components should have a seat at the table on all commissions/review boards that discuss/review Reserve Component issues; and (3) Reserve forces should take care of their members in order to sustain future recruiting and retention.
- General Handy expressed concern that General Hargett's comments sounded like "let's circle the wagons" and he disagreed with that general approach. Instead, he suggested emphasizing our militia based system that defeated the British and led to our independence as a nation. He noted that as Commander of the United States Transportation Command, he was never denied forces from the Reserve Components when he asked for them. He added that the nation would be in good hands if we had a majority of our forces in the Reserve Components.
- General Handy further added that the Reserve Components should avoid supporting policy decisions that increase their cost of doing business. He also noted that Reserve Component pay should not need defending and should not be up for discussion.
- The Chairman agreed that the Reserve Components must control costs.

0920 – RFPB Fellows Society Remarks – MG Kenneth Bouldin, USA (Ret)

- MG Bouldin thanked Chairman Punaro for providing the RFPB Fellows Society with an opportunity to participate in the annual meeting of the Board.
- He proudly noted that 2013 was the RFPB Fellows Society's third year as an organization, and that the presentation of the Citizen Patriot Awards at the RFPB dinner enhances their participation with the Board.
- MG Bouldin advocated for continued and deeper engagement with the Board, suggesting that Fellows could serve as sources of experience and expertise on Reserve Component matters.

0927 - Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs Remarks - Mr. Richard O. Wightman, Jr

- Mr. Wightman explained to the Board that in his capacity as the Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, he serves as the principal advisor to the Secretary of Defense on Reserve Component matters and is responsible for the overall supervision of Reserve Component affairs in the Department of Defense.
- He noted that the Reserve Components consist of 1.1 million Citizen Warriors, 43% of the total military end-strength of the Armed Forces, and that since 9/11 more than 870,000 Reserve Component members have been mobilized in support of various operations worldwide.
- He reminded members that the Defense Strategic Guidance calls for a smaller force, reduced priorities, reversibility, and a greater reliance on mobilized forces, and noted that the Reserve Components provide a trained, equipped, ready and available force for a fraction of the cost of comparable active forces.
- He offered that the new defense strategy, combined with current fiscal realities, point toward moving capacity and capability into the Reserve Components for routine operational use, as well as the traditional strategic hedge. He further suggested that the Reserve Components, as part of the operational force, require the following: integration into the war-fighting plans; adequate resourcing in the base budget; maintenance of operational experience that sustains vital capabilities; having trained and ready units/individuals; and having access to modernized equipment.

- Mr. Wightman suggested that evolving/emerging missions can be used to leverage Reserve Component capabilities to support the Total Force, and that the Innovative Readiness Training program provides realistic benefits to local communities and wartime missions.
- He believes that Reserve Component members should be considered for peacetime missions in order to retain their operational skills; for support to combatant commanders to fill operational requirements like MFO Sinai; and for shaping the force to meet emerging requirements like Cyber warfare.
- In conclusion, Mr. Wightman pointed out that the reason for continued Reserve Component success is the talented Citizen-Warrior.
- Mr. Wightman suggested that the 2014 Quadrennial Defense Review provides an opportunity to seriously explore new operating models, adding that in these fiscally constrained times, the Services need to propose the most capable and cost-effective “force mix” possible.
- He further suggested that the POM for FY15 provides a critical opportunity to wisely allocate reduced Defense resources. He noted that today’s combat-ready Reserve Component provides access and flexibility at a cost effective value, and that during FY 15 POM deliberations, military departments must examine fully leveraging the Reserve Component as part of the operational force during all phases of warfare, from peace to conflict.

1000 - Chairman, National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force Remarks - The Honorable Dennis M. McCarthy

- Honorable McCarthy noted that his presentation represented his individual views and opinions not those of the commission.
- He added that the conclusions of the Commission will be reflected entirely in its final report.
- He reminded members that the Commission was established in response to Congressional opposition to force structure cuts to the Air Guard and Air Force Reserve in the Air Force’s FY 2012 and FY 2013 budget submissions. The Commission’s mandate is, in accordance with Public Law 112-239, to undertake a comprehensive study of the structure of the Air Force to determine whether, and how, the structure should be modified to best fulfill current and anticipated mission requirements in a manner consistent with available resources.
- Honorable McCarthy noted that the Commission consists of eight commissioners - four appointed by Congress and four by the President - and that the statutory requirement is to produce a report by February 1, 2014 which considers: (1) Current and anticipated requirements of Combatant Commanders; (2) The appropriate balance between Active and Reserve Component forces; (3) Ensuring Active and Reserve Component forces are sufficient to provide for Homeland Defense and disaster assistance; (4) Providing sufficient numbers in the Regular USAF to provide a base of trained personnel for the Reserve Component; (5) Providing a force structure that can maintain a rotational capability that meets operational tempo goals of 1:2 for the Active Component and 1:5 for the Reserve Component; and (6) Maximizes and appropriately balances affordability, efficiency, effectiveness, capability and readiness.
- He described the Commission’s mission to recommend to the President and Congress principles of force structure and force management that, if followed, will allow the Air Force to meet present and future mission requirements within resource limits the Commission anticipates will be available.
- He noted that the Commission has covered a number of topics including: anticipated decline in overall funding; world-wide Air Force commitments; need to modernize aircraft and equipment; role of “entitlement growth” in personnel costs; the difficulty of identifying the true cost of AC and RC personnel; USAF innovations in associated units; and emerging missions (cyber, RPVs, and disaster response).

- Finally, Honorable McCarthy outlined the Commission's future schedule for hearings and site visits to a number of Air Force bases.
- Dr. Nagl suggested that Air Force Active and Reserve Component cooperation was extremely positive during the war, but that the Air Force budget submission created a rift between them, and with Congress.
- Honorable McCarthy suggested that communication between the Air Force and its Reserve Components, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congress could have been better. He noted that the practice of using non-disclosure agreements might have inadvertently undermined trust.
- Maj Gen Edwards agreed that non-disclosure agreements caused an issue of trust within the Air Force. He questioned the usefulness of non-disclosure agreements and suggested that the Reserve Components should be included in all budgetary decisions and reviews.

1107 - Former Director, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation Remarks - The Honorable Christine H. Fox

- Honorable Christine Fox reminded members that she is now a private citizen and the views expressed were hers and not those of the Department.
- She suggested that Fiscal Year 2014 will be worse than Fiscal Year 2013.
- She described two cases for the implementation of sequestration in Fiscal Year 2014. She suggested that the worst case would be to do what the Department did this year – delay implementation. She described the better case as planning for and implementing full sequestration beginning on October 1st, 2013.
- She further suggested that she expects that Fiscal Year 2015 resourcing levels will be lower than what the Department needs to execute the strategy.
- She offered that it is important for the Department to position itself for uncertainty.
- She added that understanding which decisions - regarding acquisition programs and manpower - are reversible and those that are not is also important.
- Honorable Fox then offered her observations on the current position of the Reserve Components.
- She acknowledged the contributions and sacrifices of the Reserves Components; the increased legislative flexibility on access to the Reserves Components; and recent progress in understanding costs.
- She noted that the RFPB's Cost Methodology Report has helped the Department to better understand "fully-burdened" and "life-cycle" costs.
- On the other hand, she suggested that the National Guard is perceived as contributing to tension within the Department, because the Guard is entangled in state and federal politics. She also noted that the Guard is infused with passion and sometimes argues points with more passion than rigorous analysis and fact.
- She noted that the Department lacks analytics with regard to what the Reserve Components have done operationally, and argued the Department would be well served if it understood this in an analytical way.
- Honorable Fox described three driving factors to better position the Guard and Reserve for the future. They include: (1) The ability of the Reserve Components to field complex war fighting skills rapidly; (2) Improving access to Reserve Component personnel and equipment in wartime; and (3) Providing access to Reserve Components skills and equipment in peacetime.
- She then offered suggestions to improve Reserve Component positioning. Specifically, she suggested that the National Guard and Reserve continue to develop its analytic capability to enhance objectivity; to aid in the development of better analytical data with regard to homeland

requirements and to better describe state “needs” for the National Guard; and to steer clear of state and federal politics to build trust.

- The Chairman suggested that military pay and compensation is a major cost driver worthy of further study by the Department.
- Honorable Fox responded that military compensation is consuming half of the DoD budget and that it is a difficult area to tackle. She suggested that the Secretary’s Strategic Choices and Management Review (SCMR) group discussed, but failed to act in this area. She offered that the growth in pay, health care and base housing costs need to be curtailed. She also noted that the active component retirement system needs to be revised.
- Dr. Nagl agreed, but noted that politically there is no chance of changing force structure, eliminating excess infrastructure through BRAC, or reducing benefits. As a result, he assessed that readiness will suffer and we might end up with an oversized and under ready force.

1149 - Under Secretary of Defense (Comptroller) Remarks - The Honorable Robert F. Hale

- Honorable Hale reminded members that the Department was nearing the close of Fiscal Year 2013. He noted that the Department would end the year in a deep fiscal hole and with reduced overall mission readiness, but stated the Department would meet the year’s fiscal monetary target.
- He suggested that there were three potential outcomes for the Fiscal Year 2104 budget: (1) A big budget deal, which would require several political miracles; (2) A mini-budget deal, which would still require several political miracles; or (3) Gridlock with no change in the Budget Control Act, a potential year-long continuing resolution, and a potential government shutdown with another tough fiscal year. Gridlock was the most likely option!
- He noted that he did not know for sure what would happen in these next few months, but he did know that there were no deals on the horizon.
- He stated that the best approach was to have several detailed planning options available, especially considering the size of the planned fiscal reduction for Fiscal year 2014 - \$52 Billion.
- Honorable Hale suggested that there are a number of activities the Department must act on. They include: completing the responsible drawdown in Afghanistan; recovering readiness lost as a result of funding cuts in FY13; minimizing additional readiness cuts in FY14; looking for additional efficiencies; slowing compensation growth; eliminating unnecessary infrastructure; shrinking active and reserve manpower; maintaining the all-volunteer force; and better balancing the drawdown in manpower, modernization, and readiness.
- The Chairman asked Honorable Hale if he had some suggestions on how the Guard and Reserve can become more efficient.
- Honorable Hale noted that the Guard and Reserve are spread throughout the various States. He suggested that consolidating Guard and Reserve units at fewer locations could create efficiencies. He also said that the Reserve Components need to look at their current military compensation system, which was originally used to support All-Volunteer Force recruitment and retention. He suggested that the current military compensation system will be increasingly difficult to maintain.
- Honorable Martin asked Honorable Hale to further clarify his view regarding a balanced force structure drawdown.
- Honorable Hale offered that the force structure drawdown during the 1990’s cut too deeply into the investment accounts. He urged caution in considering major cuts in investments this time around. He did note that it would be difficult to do, given the size of the cuts required and the ability to achieve quicker savings in the short term with investment cuts verses the longer time required for force structure and personnel reductions.

- Maj Gen Stewart noted that the Secretary's Strategic Choices and Management Review group suggested two options for force structure: (1) having a force that is smaller and more technologically advanced; or (2) having a larger, less modern force. He asked if there wasn't some middle option that deserved consideration, like using the Reserve Components to fill the manpower gap presented in option one.
- Honorable Hale suggested that the Services should consider all options in their POM process, and that force structure reductions to the Active and Reserve Components should be more balanced.

1240 - VADM (Ret) John Cotton, Subcommittee Chair, provided an update from the Subcommittee on Ensuring a Ready, Capable, Available and Sustainable Operational Reserve.

- VADM (Ret) Cotton outlined the undertakings of the Subcommittee during the Fiscal Year. His subcommittee proposed, and the Board approved, two reports with six recommendations for submission to the Secretary of Defense.
- The recommendations ranged from defining the term "Operational Reserve" to outlining Base Realignment and Closure process governance and the conduct of the Quadrennial Defense Review. VADM (Ret) Cotton provided an update and status on each of the subcommittee's recommendations.
- Next, VADM (Ret) Cotton introduced the topic of Reserve Component "off-ramping".
- He noted that over the past several months, the Department "off-ramped" over 16,000 reservists from assigned missions in FY13 and FY14 – some because of the drawdown in Afghanistan and others because of budget shortfalls.
- He further noted that despite the number of "off-ramped" personnel, reported hardship cases remain low.
- He pointed out that the Department has established policy already in place regarding advance notification for Reserve Component mobilization and demobilization. He further stated that the policy also covers how to handle short notice cancellations due to operational Combatant Commander requirements. The subcommittee will continue its review to determine if the current DoD policy is sufficient.
- VADM (Ret) Cotton offered that a potentially larger issue is the appearance that the Department is moving away from the operational use of the Reserve Components.
- He noted recent Congressional action - The Armed Services Committees in both Houses have drafted legislation in their National Defense Authorization Bills to restrict DoD's flexibility on the mobilization and demobilization of the Reserve Components and the Department's opposition to those provisions.
- The Chairman commented that legislative restrictions on access to the Reserve Components are, while well meaning, unhelpful. He suggested that the Board consider providing advice to the Secretary on this matter.
- Therefore, the subcommittee proposed the following recommendation:

Recommendation #1

The Secretary of Defense should add public and private emphasis to the Department's opposition to Section 511 of H.R. 1960 requiring the Department of Defense to provide advanced notice of Reserve Component "Off-Ramping" because it hinders future access to the Reserve Components.

- A motion was made to forward the recommendation to the Secretary of Defense. The motion was seconded and approved by the Board without objection.

1250 – Ms. Paulette Mason, Subcommittee Chair, provided an update from the Subcommittee on Supporting Service Members, Families and Employers.

- Ms. Mason provided an update to the Board on its Reserve Component Survivor Benefits Plan (SBP) Disparity Issue recommendation.
- The Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness office has been assigned the task of replying to this recommendation.

1253 – Maj Gen Mike Edwards, Subcommittee Chair, provided an update from the Subcommittee on Enhancing DoD's Role in the Homeland.

- Maj Gen Edwards updated the Board on its open matter under review - funding for Presidential Nominating Conventions and other National Security Special Events.
- He noted additional possible matters for Subcommittee examination, including:
 - Refining procedures for using Title 10 Reserve Component personnel for natural disasters via Title 10 USC 12304a
 - Enhancing the Dual Status Commander's common operating picture
 - Improving natural disaster planning utilizing Reserve Component emergency power capabilities
 - Improving National Guard's State Partnership Program partner nations CBRN response capabilities
- Determining DoD's baseline Defense Support of Civil Authorities (DSCA) capabilities to support civil authorities in emergencies
- Chairman Punaro commented that Board members would be better informed on the issue if the subcommittee could determine the Department's current status on identifying Homeland Defense requirements.

1257 - MG Marcia Anderson, Subcommittee Chair, provided an update from the Subcommittee on Creating a Continuum of Service.

- MG Anderson provided members an update on subcommittee recommendations associated with its April 2012 Report, Avoiding Past Drawdown Mistakes, and its July 2013 Report on Duty Status Reform.
- MG Anderson also updated the Board on the status of joint Department of Defense and Veterans Administration efforts to update the DD 214.
- Chairman Punaro asked if the Services recognized the compelling need to reduce the number of Duty Statuses.
- Dr. Nagl suggested that Ms. Wright's confirmation as Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness might offer the best opportunity for the Department to finally address the question of Duty Status Reform.
- Chairman Punaro suggested that it might be useful to approach the Veterans Administration about taking other forms of official DoD documentation of service.
- MajGen Davis, from the Reserve Officers Association, offered that there are some 300,000 former Reserve Component service members who lack DD 214s and the veteran status they deserve.

1310 – Honorable Grier Martin, Task Group Chair, provided an update from the SECDEF Strategic Question Task Group.

- Hon. Martin reminded members of the charge given to the Board from former Secretary Panetta.
- Hon. Martin reminded members that the Board had received an interim report from the Task Group in April 2013, which resulted in a letter of advice to Secretary Hagel.
- Hon. Martin presented the Group's Final Report and recommendations for deliberation.

The first question Secretary Panetta posed to the Board was: "What are the best ways to use the Reserve Components in support of the Defense Strategic Guidance?"

- Hon. Martin made the following observations regarding the use of the Reserve Components:
 - The Reserve Components should be employed operationally as an integral component of our National Defense Strategy.
 - The Reserve Components should be used to support all ten DoD Priority Missions and other missions required by the President and Governors.
 - The Reserve Components have a demonstrated record of sustained accessibility, readiness, and reliability.
 - Many senior defense leaders are unaware of the differences between the National Guard and the Reserves; the strength of the RC; the capabilities resident in the RC; the costs to maintain and use the RC; or the limitations on their use.
 - Senior defense leaders lack a Total Force perspective, and thus, focus on the Active Component as the only solution to challenges.
 - The 2010 QDR did not address the roles and missions of the Reserve Components as required by Title 10 Section 118.
 - The SCMR group failed to address the size, shape, and use of the Guard and Reserve in support of DoD Strategy.
 - The 2014 QDR is the last opportunity to deal with these questions, in a meaningful way, and it does not appear that it will.
- Hon. Martin offered the following recommendations relative to the future Use of the Reserve Components:

Recommendation #1 (As Proposed)

Plan and Use the RC Operationally: DoD should continue to use the Reserve Components operationally and should include requirements for such use in service force generation models, and DoD planning, programming, and budget documents.

- The Board approved Recommendation #1 as proposed.

Recommendation #2 (As Proposed)

Develop and Enforce a Revised DoD Total Force Policy: DoD should develop and enforce a revised Total Force Policy to encourage a Total Force culture.

- The Board approved Recommendation #2 as proposed.

Recommendation #3 (As Proposed)

Study the Effectiveness of the RC: DoD should charter an independent and impartial study to assess the operational effectiveness of the Reserve Components since 9/11.

- Dr. Nagl noted the Board's important work on clarifying the cost of the Reserve Components and the impact it has had with regard to discussions on the Force Mix and Use of the Reserve Components. He noted that now that significant analysis shows that the Reserve Components are cheaper to maintain, the argument next turns to the question of effectiveness.
- The Chairman noted the potential difficulty in finding an independent and impartial body to conduct the study.
- One modification was made to the original recommendation.

Recommendation #3 (As Modified)

Study the Effectiveness of the RC: DoD should charter an independent and impartial study to assess the operational effectiveness of the Service Reserve Components since 9/11.

- The Board approved Recommendation #3 with modification.

The next question posed to the Board by Secretary Panetta was: "What is the right balance of Active and Reserve Component forces?"

- Hon. Martin made the following observations regarding AC/RC force mix:
 - The SCMR concluded that the Department should not take reductions proportionally across the military services; proportional reductions are equally inappropriate when examining Service AC/RC Mix.
 - The Department should preserve RC end strength to maximize defense capability and capacity if the Department decides to reduce active end strength.
 - The resultant structure should be a more capable force that is better integrated, and smartly employed.
- Hon. Martin offered the following recommendations relative to AC/RC force mix:

Recommendation #1 (As Proposed)

Preserve RC to Mitigate Risk from AC Cuts: DoD should preserve RC end strength and force structure to mitigate risk associated with increased AC force structure reductions and to hedge against fiscal and geostrategic uncertainty.

- General Handy noted that end strength and structure should be adjusted based on the requirements outlined in our National Strategy.

Recommendation #1 (As Modified)

Adjust RC to Mitigate Risk from AC Cuts: Based on National Security Strategy and the upcoming QDR, DoD should adjust RC end strength and force structure to mitigate risk associated with AC force structure reductions and to hedge against fiscal and geostrategic uncertainty.

- The Board approved Recommendation #1 with modification.

Recommendation #2 (As Proposed)

Expand RC in Key Skill Areas: DoD should examine those mission capabilities where the Reserve Components have a distinct advantage due to their civilian acquired skills and exposure to new technologies in the workplace (i.e. Cyber, ISR and UAV).

- Dr. Nagl proposed wording to include expansion of those capabilities.

Recommendation #2 (As Modified)

Expand RC in Key Skill Areas: DoD should examine and consider expanding those mission capabilities where the Reserve Components have a distinct advantage due to their civilian acquired skills and exposure to new technologies in the workplace and the expanded role of the National Guard and Reserves in those areas (i.e. Cyber, ISR and RPA).

- The Board approved Recommendation #2 with modification.

The next question posed to the Board by Secretary Panetta was: “What does it cost to maintain a Strong Reserve?”

- Hon. Martin made the following observations regarding the cost of a Strong Reserve:
 - For about \$50B per year (10% of DoD’s Total Obligation Authority) the Department maintains a Strong Reserve; RC is approximately 40% of DoD’s total end strength.
 - Through a decade of investment and war, we have built a more capable, better equipped, battle tested Guard and Reserve force than we have had at any time in our recent history.
 - DoD shouldn’t squander the benefits derived from those investments and the hard won experience gained during more than a decade of war.
 - While the force is integrated on the battlefield, fiscal pressures are undermining Total Force Integration here in Washington DC.
 - Commission on the Structure of the Air Force
 - Tone of Army discussion on RC force size and use
 - As the Active Component draws down, the Reserve Components provide a place to retain talent while also preserving the Strength (proven combat readiness) of the Reserves.
- Hon. Martin offered the following recommendations relative to a Strong Reserve:

Recommendation #1 (As Proposed)

Improve AC/RC Integration: The Services should better integrate its forces organizationally, in training, and during operational employment.

- The Board deferred a decision on Recommendation #1 to consider the “Strong Reserve” recommendations as a package.

Recommendation #2 (As Proposed)

Effectively Use Available Manpower: As Active Component end strength and force structure declines, DoD should make better use of its available manpower.

- Dr. Nagl suggested the inclusion of the phrase “Total Force”

Recommendation #2 (As Modified)

Effectively Use Available Manpower: As Active Component end strength and force structure declines, DoD should make better use of its available Total Force manpower.

- The Board deferred a decision on Recommendation #2 to consider the “Strong Reserve” recommendations as a package.

Recommendation #3 (As Proposed)

Invest in Smart Readiness: DoD should invest only in that readiness necessary to meet known operational requirements and to prepare early deploying forces, regardless of component.

- The Chairman asked if the recommendation should limit requirements to operational requirements, and questioned whether the recommendation should include immediate response forces for the homeland as well.
- The Chairman also questioned the use of the term “Smart Readiness”. He had not heard the term used before and questioned whether we should be introducing new terminology.
- ADM Cotton noted that the Department already employs “tiered” readiness, but was unsure of the terminology we should use in our description.
- Dr. Nagl suggested use of the phrase “Appropriate Readiness.”
- Maj Gen Edwards suggested that the Department will misinterpret the recommendation and take it as signal to fund Active Component requirements over Reserve Component requirements.
- General Handy offered that the interpretation of the recommendation will be in the “eye of the beholder”.
- Hon. Taylor suggested that the recommendation might lead to more problems than it solves.
- MajGen Williams asked if this recommendation isn't already implied in recommendation Number 1.
- As a result of the discussion on all of the recommendations, the Board directed the Task Group to rework Recommendation #3.

The final question posed to the Board by Secretary Panetta was: “How can the Department achieve cost savings (with a Reserve Component nexus)?”

- Hon. Martin made the following observations regarding potential Cost Savings:
 - The Reserve Components are a proven, responsive, cost-effective investment in experienced defense capability, with unique civilian skills.
 - Retaining already lean Reserve Component force structure and using it operationally is already an efficient way to do business.
 - While already cost effective, there are opportunities for additional savings.
- Hon. Martin offered the following recommendations relative to potential Cost Savings:

Recommendation #1 (As Proposed)

Use the RC Operationally: DoD should retain cost effective RC force structure and use it operationally as an efficiency.

- General Handy suggested the elimination of the recommendation.
- The Board directed the Task Group to reconsider Recommendation #1 as part of an overall review of proposed efficiencies.

Recommendation #2 (As Proposed)

Co-locate/Share Equipment: DoD should explore creative opportunities to co-locate and share AC and RC equipment for training and operational use.

- The Board directed the Task Group to reconsider Recommendation #2 as part of an overall review of proposed efficiencies.

Recommendation #3 (As Proposed)

Co-locate/Share Facilities: During future BRAC rounds, DoD should aggressively seek more opportunities to consolidate AC and RC facilities.

- General Handy suggested the removal of the reference to BRAC.
- The Board directed the Task Group to reconsider Recommendation #3 as part of an overall review of proposed efficiencies.

Recommendation #4 (As Proposed)

Continually Review RC Administrative Overhead: DoD should continue to review administrative overhead costs of the Reserve Components and it should specifically consider examining requirements associated with:

- Headquarters, Management Layers, and Commands
 - The Reserve Component Fulltime Support Program
 - The Annual Physical Health Assessment Requirement
 - The Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program
 - The National Guard Youth Challenge Program
 - The DoD STARBASE Program
-
- Hon. Taylor argued against the inclusion of the Physical Health Assessment, Yellow Ribbon, and Youth Challenge programs.
 - The Chairman suggested that the Board needed to do more work in the area of potential Reserve Component efficiencies.
 - Dr. Nagl suggested that the unconsidered question is the potential efficiency that might come from merging the National Guard and Reserve.
 - ADM Cotton recommended a broader review be done on the organization of the Reserve Components.

- The Board directed the Task Group to reconsider Recommendation #4 as part of an overall review of proposed efficiencies.

1425 – Mr. Sergio Pecori, Task Group Chair, provided an update from the RFPB Cyber Policy Task Group.

- Mr. Pecori introduced the members of his Task Group and the Charter received from the RFPB Chairman, which included requirements to:
 - Assess DoD's current path in developing its cyber organization, policies, and doctrine.
 - Examine the proposed staffing mix of active, reserve, and civilian personnel.
 - Consider how the Reserve Components should be organized, manned and equipped in order to meet the stated DoD strategy.
- Mr Pecori also discussed his initial office calls with various DoD organizations and made the observation that many Reserve Component units participated in a recent U.S. Cybercom Exercise called CYBERGUARD 13.
- Finally, Mr Pecori presented the Task Group's proposed work plan for Board consideration.
- Hon. Taylor suggested that the cyber field is a viable path for retaining wounded warriors and worthy of some consideration as the Task Group does its work.

1435 – The Military Executive presented several administrative proposals to the Board during the "Chairman's Time"

- Major General Stewart proposed, and the Board approved, the Report layout for the Fiscal Year 2013 Reserve Forces Policy Board Annual Report to the President and Congress; The Board approved the following content:
 - Executive Summary
 - Introduction
 - Summary of meetings
 - Overview
 - RFPB Reports of Advice and Recommendations to the Secretary
 - Impact of Recommendations Made
 - Appendix 1- RFPB Members and Staff
 - Appendix 2- Governing Statute
 - Appendix 3- Reserve Component Contributions to the National Defense
- Next, Maj Gen Stewart proposed that the Board consolidate its two personnel-related subcommittees into one subcommittee (The Subcommittee on Supporting & Sustaining Reserve Component Personnel), which will be broadly responsible for strategies, policies and practices related to personnel management, family, and employer support issues. This new subcommittee will handle all matters covered by both the Continuum of Service and Supporting Service Members, Families & Employers subcommittees.
- The motion was seconded and approved by the Board without objection; the new subcommittee structure and assignments are effective immediately.
- Approved subcommittee structure and new assignments are as follows:
 - Subcommittee on Ensuring a Ready, Capable, Available and Sustainable Operational Reserve
 - VADM (Ret) Cotton – Chair
 - General (Ret) Handy

- Lt Gen (Ret) Sherrard
- MajGen Moore
- RADM Welch
- Dr. Nagl
- CAPT (Ret) Halfaker (Upon Appointment)
- Subcommittee on Enhancing DoD's Role in the Homeland
 - Maj Gen Edwards – Chair
 - Hon. Taylor
 - Ms. Vorel
 - Maj Gen Stewart
 - MajGen (Ret) Williams
 - MG Wofford (Upon Appointment)
- Subcommittee on Supporting & Sustaining Reserve Component Personnel
 - MG Anderson – Chair
 - Hon. Martin
 - RADM Penniman
 - Mr. Pecori
 - Ms. Mason
 - SGM Biere
- Finally, Maj Gen Stewart proposed the following tentative dates for FY14 Board Meetings:
 - The Board will hold a meeting during the first two weeks in December 2013 – exact date is pending subject to availability of the Secretary of Defense
 - 5 March 2014
 - 4 June 2014
 - 10 September 2014
- The motion was seconded and approved by the Board without objection.

1542 - RFPB concluded business in Open Session.

The Board acknowledged receipt of several letters (with attachments) from Senator Robert P. Casey, Jr., Senator Patrick J. Toomey, Senator Joe Manchin III, Governor Earl Tomblin, and Governor Tom Corbett requesting that the Board take up the matter of assessing future Army force structure. The Chairman will consider their request.

1545 - Meeting of the Reserve Forces Policy Board adjourned.



Arnold L. Punaro
Major General, USMCR (Ret)
Chairman, Reserve Forces Policy Board